## Comment for planning application 24/00097/F

| Application Number | 24/00097/F   |
|--------------------|--|
| Location           | Land South Side Of Widnell Lane Piddington   |
| Proposal           | RETROSPECTIVE - Material Change of Use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 12 gypsy/traveller families, each with two caravans, including improvement of access, laying of hardstanding and installation of package sewage treatment plant  |
| Case Officer       | Jeanette Davey   |
| Organisation       |  |
| Name               | Mr John Bell & Mrs Meg Bell  |
| Address            | Fir Tree House,78 Lower End,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1QD   |
| Type of Comment    | Objection  |
| Туре               | neighbour  |
| Comments           | Application Reference: 24/00097/F<br>Applicant : Mr H.L.Foster<br>Site Address: Land south of Widnell Lane<br>Representations by Mr John Bell & Mrs Meg Bell<br>78 Lower End, Piddington, OX251QD  |
|                    | 29th February 2024   |
|                    | We have lived in Piddington for over 45 years and so we are familiar with this site.<br>We most strongly object to this application which we urge the Council to refuse.   |
|                    | It is not necessary to repeat every point made in the numerous objections which have<br>already been submitted but suffice it to say that we have studied and concur with them all.<br>In particular we strongly support the case against the proposals set out by The Piddington<br>Parish Council in its very relevant submission.   |
|                    | Since the first application was made in 2017 for this ill-considered and objectionable proposal, nothing has happened or been suggested that would make it less objectionable. Quite the reverse, the case against it is now stronger that ever for, inter alia, two particular reasons;   |
|                    | First: Global warming has caused a huge increase in rainfall and flooding in this location as<br>we have witnessed over the last few months. It is predicted to get a lot worse. This, coupled<br>with the heavy clay soil in the locality, has already significantly increased the level of ground<br>saturation and run-off from the site rendering the precautions suggested by the applicant as<br>sadly inadequate, even risible.<br>Already flooding from the adjacent ditch and ponding over the highway are evidence of this<br>problem. |
|                    | This increase in the level of ground water saturation and run-off will, in the absence of a main sewer, make the disposal of human effluent to the adjacent ditch perhaps via a soakaway from the vaguely described "package sewage treatment plant" to be totally unsuitable. See also the response of 13/02/24 by the LLFA   |
|                    | Second: The recent development of adjacent land as a concrete batching plant. This has<br>caused a significant increase in traffic on B4011 and, more importantly for future occupants<br>of the site, a serious danger to air quality making the site unfit for human habitation.<br>In this connection, please see the objections of 18/02/24 by Tim McNally of Old Dairy, Manor<br>Farm.<br>Also of 7/02/24 by Andrew Coleman of 14 Lower End. He also provides photographs and<br>deals with other salient points.                           |
|                    | Before ending, it is worth repeating what we wrote in our objection on 2nd November 2017<br>and which still applies and we now quote:<br>"These objections reveal just the tip of an iceberg of unsuitability and, to reiterate, would if<br>allowed, almost certainly be the thin edge of the wedge leading to a significant expansion of   |

the proposed use over the years. This is clearly a thoroughly unsatisfactory proposal which does not appear to have been properly researched and which should, like the previous application, be refused."

Finally, it is clear that the consent granted on appeal for 6 gypsy families has expired. This leaves the site free of any planning permission for this use. That being so, it is more important than ever for the Council to firmly refuse this current application and then to resist any re-run of the applicant's 7 year war of attrition.

In due course, perhaps the Council should consider requiring the site owners to make good the damage to the environment they have already caused including the reinstatement of the two ponds previously identified as habitats of Great Crested New

Received Date Attachments 29/02/2024 16:36:13